

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully thank the Examiner for granting a personal interview on June 8, 2007.

The foregoing identical amendments in independent claims 1, 16 and 17 follow up on that interview. In particular, the final paragraph of each of these claims, as suggested by the Examiner, provide a clearer statement of the sequential or causal relationship between "selecting of said detail setting" and a change in display state of the interruption key. This sequential/causal connection is now characterized using the phrase "as a result of," as also suggested by the Examiner.

As discussed below in greater detail, in part to provide a written record of the interview, the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed sequential/causal connection between "selecting of said detail setting key" and "the interrupt key changes its display state."

The amendments in claims 1, 16 and 17 also tie the detail setting and pop-up screen to a job being processed or a job that is standing by. This, in part, follows up on the discussion at the interview of the job list 57 and the displayed icons 57a and 57b (Fig. 1) corresponding to the job being processed and the job standing by, respectively. As also noted at the interview, the job list and these icons are discussed in relationship to the interruption key 60 at least at page 30, lines 11-24.

These amendments are also in response to the Examiner's first responsive comments on page 13 of the Action that certain arguments made in Applicant's last Response were not reflected in the claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0041390 to Mizuno et al. when combined with U.S. Patent No. 5,267,327 to Hirayama.

As discussed at the interview and in prior prosecution, Mizuno describes a copier with detail settings, various displays (e.g. Figs. 6A-6F) and an interrupt key is shown in Fig. 4 and discussed in para. 0067. A clear key 12, also discussed there, clears the number of copies and stopping a continuing copy operation. The interrupt key 15 allows the operator to start a "copying operation for another document during a continuing copying operation for a document." (para. 0067). The interrupt key 15 does not change its state. Also, the display of Figs. 6A-6F, including a "main screen 12" shown in Fig. 6A, are displayed sequentially.

Hirayama '327 describes a device that correlates successive characters input by hand on a tablet with a desired block letter character. The Examiner cites interrupt key 66 (Fig. 5) at Col. 10, lines 56-59 of Hirayama as teaching a change of state of this key. As noted at the interview, and argued previously, this "interrupt" key stops the interactive process of writing handwritten characters to establish the desired association. It is therefore a stop key, more like Mizuno clear key 12 than Mizuno interrupt key 15. Moreover, the device of Hirayama is not a copier, and does not address the problem of avoiding confusion of the operator as to what displayed detail settings relate to what job. It has no detail setting keys and no pop-up screens.

The claims as amended herein are clearly different from these prior art devices, even if they can, somehow, be combined. The prior art does not teach or suggest a sequential/causal connection, as now more clearly claimed, between selecting of one of the detail setting keys and the interruption key changing its state as a result of a selecting of a detail setting key of a job. The display control main construction of the present invention prevents user confusion as to whether pop-up screen displayed detail items are valid or invalid when an interruption key is selected and therefore another job is selected.

With respect to the Section 103(a) rejections of claims 5, 8, 10 and 13-15, Applicants noted again at the interview that while the tertiary references to Hiroshima (published application), Kato, Nishimura, and Sadakuni, in the combinations detailed in the Action, show isolated features, they do not supply the deficiencies noted above with

respect to Mizuno and Hiroyama '327. Only Nishimura even has an interrupt key and it works differently, as noted in Applicant's previous response.

In view of the foregoing amendments and Remarks, Applicants believe that the pending amended claims are clearly allowable over the art of record, whether considered alone or in any combination, and that this application is otherwise in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5530

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant